

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 21 December 2006. Responsive to that Office Action, Claim 2 has been canceled and Claim 1 is amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such amendment of Claim 1, there is a further clarification of the pending Claims' recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gaines, et al. reference in view of the Anderson, et al. and Irion, et al. references. Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 8 and 9 under 34 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gaines, et al. reference, Anderson, et al. and Irion, et al. references and further in view of the Wevers, et al. reference. In setting forth the former rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Gaines, et al. fails to disclose extruding the polymer onto the surface of the lamination roller prior to contacting the fabric at the nip, but cited the Anderson, et al. reference for disclosing such, concluding that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for various reasons to have incorporated such into the method of Gaines, et al.

As newly-amended independent Claim 1 now more clearly recites, Applicant's claimed method includes among its combination of steps, "... adjusting an angular position of said carrying roller relative to said lamination roller ...". In this manner, the carrying roller 4 may be disposed or arranged in

different angular positions relative to the lamination roller 8, to change the engaging portion of the heated or melted soft film or coating 1 with the segment 83 of the outer peripheral portion 81 of the lamination roller 8. .

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claims is nowhere disclosed by the cited references. Note, as the Examiner readily acknowledged, the primarily-cited Gaines, et al. reference fails to disclose extruding the polymer onto the surface of the lamination roller prior to contacting the fabric at the nip. Even beyond this, the Gains, et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest adjusting the angular position of the carrying roller relative to the lamination roller.

The Anderson, et al. reference is deficient in its teachings much in the manner of the Gaines, et al. reference. Although the Examiner stated that the Anderson, et al. reference "does imply the distance of the lamination roll of the polymer can be varied", no such implication can be found. In fact, the Anderson, et al. reference nowhere discloses or suggests adjusting the angular position of the carrying roller relative to the lamination roller.

Admittedly, the Anderson, et al. reference goes into detail discussing the formation of the polyethylene coated web and transferring the coated web for application of the hot melt coating (by a separate rolling system), with no mention of adjustments to any rollers being disclosed. Any inference or implication of such a feature is unfounded.

Given such contrary and deficient teachings of the Gaines, et al. and the Anderson, et al. references, the other secondarily-cited Irion, et al. reference and Wevers, et al. reference are found to be quite ineffectual to the present patentability analysis. Those references were cited for disclosing isolated features but fail to sufficiently remedy the deficiencies of the Gaines, et al. and Anderson, et al. references.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the Gaines, et al., Anderson, et al., Irion, et al., and Wevers, et al. references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of method steps now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If there are any further charges associated with this filing, the Honorable Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account #18-2011 for such charges.

Respectfully submitted,  
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Rajiv S. Shah  
Registration #56,247

Dated: 4/12/07

Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678  
Customer No. 04586